DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 461 086 CS 012 687

AUTHOR	Bufalino, Janet
TITLE	Pennsylvania Reading Recovery Four Year Report, 1991-1995.
INSTITUTION	Shippensburg Univ., PA.; Reading Recovery Council of North America, Columbus, OH.
PUB DATE	1996-10-00
NOTE	16p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Early Intervention; Primary Education; Program Effectiveness; Program Implementation; Reading Programs; *Remedial Reading; *Teacher Education; Training
IDENTIFIERS	Maryland; Pennsylvania; *Reading Recovery Projects; Shippensburg University PA

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes the development and implementation of Reading Recovery programs in Pennsylvania and Maryland. The first section of the booklet presents a synopsis of the Reading Recovery program. The next section discusses training for Reading Recovery educators. The third section presents a historical overview of the Shippensburg University training site. The fourth section presents a brief overview of Reading Recovery teachers, students and sites for the 1994-95 school year. The last section of the booklet discusses implementation of the Reading Recovery program and research results from the 1994-95 school year. A list of Reading Recovery training sites in Pennsylvania and Maryland is attached. (RS)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 461 086

READING RECOVERY® COUNCIL OF NORTH AMERICA

Shippensburg University

Pennsylvania Reading Recovery Four Year Report 1991 – 1995

Dr. Janet Bufalino
Reading Recovery Trainer
of Teacher Leaders

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Bufalino
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

October 1996

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Shippensburg University

A member of Pennsylvania's State System of Higher Education

CS012687

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Reading Recovery Program
Four Year Report

Table of Contents

The Reading Recovery Program 1

Reading Recovery Training 3

Shippensburg University Training Site 3

Overview of Reading Recovery Teachers, Students, and Sites 1994-1995 5

Program Implementation 5

Pennsylvania & Maryland Teacher and Teacher Leader Training Sites 11

Acknowledgments:

Dr. Robert Bartos, Dean of Education and Human Services, Shippensburg University

Dr. Peggy Hockersmith, Assistant Dean of Education, Shippensburg University, PA Reading Recovery Site Coordinator

Dr. Audrey Sprenger, Chair of Department of Teacher Education, Shippensburg University

Dr. John Martin, Former Chair of Department of Teacher Education, Shippensburg University

Mr. James Sheffer, Chief, Division of Federal Programs, Pennsylvania Department of Education

Mr. Richard Brickley, Pennyslvania NDN Facilitator

Ms. Terri Williams, Pennsylvania NDN Administrative Assistant

Reading Committee of the Department of Teacher Education, Shippensburg University

Department of Teacher Education, Shippensburg University

Conestoga Valley School District students, Travis and Trevor Griffith, with Teacher Leader Mr. Craig Ausel.

The Reading Recovery Program

Four Year Report

Program Overview

Reading Recovery was developed and initiated by New Zealand educator and psychologist Dr. Marie M. Clay to provide a second chance in reading and writing for young children who are at-risk of failure in their first year of formal reading instruction. Individually administered observation procedures are used to identify children in need of special help. Intervention procedures are then individually tailored to help identified children become successful readers.

Reading Recovery is based on the assumption that intensive instruction during a child's early year of schooling is the most productive investment of resources. Intervention at this time gives a child a chance to succeed before he/she enters a cycle of failure (Clay, 1993; 1985).

A Program for Children

Children are selected for the program based on authentic measures of assessment and classroom teacher judgment. Their regular classroom instruction is then supplemented with daily, 30-minute, one-to-one lessons with a specifically trained Reading Recovery teacher for 12-20 weeks.

The lessons consist of a variety of reading and writing experiences designed to help a child develop effective strategies for reading and writing. Instruction continues until the child can read at or above the class average and can continue to learn without later remedial help. The child is then "discontinued" from the program, providing the opportunity for another child to become an independent reader.

Over 150,000 children have benefited from Reading Recovery since it's introduction to North America in 1985. Almost 85% of the children who have completed a Reading Recovery program in North America have become independent readers (Executive Summary, 1984-1994).

> ***Reading Recovery is a wonderful program in that it not only teaches children basic reading skills but teaches them in such a way that they are able to carry on even after they've completed the program.***
>
> **Parent**
> *North Penn School District*

The Reading Recovery Lesson

Reading Recovery teachers use a battery of six measures called the Observation Survey to select the most at-risk children from the lowest achieving children. In addition to regular classroom reading instruction, these children receive one-to-one Reading Recovery lessons for 30 minutes each day.

The Observation Survey

Children are selected for Reading Recovery using both classroom teacher judgment and results from the Observation Survey. Looking across measures, teachers select children who are the lowest achievers first. The following six measures comprise this diagnostic tool:

1. **Letter Identification:** Children are asked to identify 54 different characters including upper and lowercase letters and convention print for "a" and "g."
2. **Word Test:** Children are asked to read down a list of 20 words drawn from the words used most frequently in early reading material.
3. **Concepts About Print:** Children are asked to perform a variety of tasks during a book reading. These tasks, presented in a standard situation, check on significant concepts about printed language, such as directionality and concept of word.
4. **Writing Vocabulary:** Within a 10-minute period, children are asked to write all the words they know. The score on this test is the number of words written accurately.
5. **Dictation Test:** Teachers read a sentence to the children, who write the words, indicating their ability to analyze the words for sounds.
6. **Text Reading Level:** Measures of text reading level are obtained by using a gradient of text difficulty, then testing for the highest level read with 90% accuracy or better.

Lesson Components

Each lesson includes the following components:

- Reading many known stories
- Reading a story that was read once the day before (running record)
- Writing a story
- Working with a cut-up sentence
- Reading a new book

The components of a Reading Recovery lesson remain fairly consistent from child to child. However, each lesson is unique. The child and teacher have their own interactions which determine the direction each lesson may take. The teacher constantly observes the child's responses. Activities are then based upon these responses. Books to be used are chosen specifically with each child in mind. Books are selected from a variety of "little books" from numerous publishers for their appropriateness of natural language, meaning, and level of difficulty.

Lesson Components

- **Reading Familiar Books:** The child is able to read two to three books exhibiting behaviors characteristic of good readers. The teacher supports these behaviors through appropriate and well chosen questions or prompts.
- **Running Record Book:** The child reads the new book from the previous lesson independently while the teacher records reading behaviors. This information is used in making instructional decisions and to choose teaching points to be used after the reading.
- **Writing a Story:** The child composes a story about a book read or a personal experience. Through joint problem-solving, the child and teacher work together to write the story. The child writes as independently as possible.
- **Working with a Cut-up Sentence:** After writing the story, the sentence is written on a sentence strip and cut up. The child uses knowledge of the story to search and monitor for cues while reassembling the sentence.
- **Reading a New Book:** The teacher introduces a new book, providing a framework for the meaning and language structures the child will meet. This book should offer a little more challenge than previous books read in the lesson, but be within the child's abilities.

Reading Recovery Training

Levels of Training (Executive Summary, 1984-1994)

Training for Reading Recovery educators consists of one year of instruction followed by extensive continuing contact. Training is offered on three levels at approved sites across the world:

1. **Teacher Training** — master's level instruction provided by trained and certified Reading Recovery teacher leaders at approved district-level training sites. This training prepares experienced classroom teachers to provide Reading Recovery for children in their schools. During the training year, teachers attend weekly classes, work with four children daily, and participate in area meetings with their instructors and colleagues.
2. **Teacher Leader Training** — postgraduate instruction, provided by a trained and certified trainer of teacher leaders at approved university regional training centers. This instruction prepares qualified educators to teach children, train teachers, and operate a Reading Recovery site. Teacher Leaders-in-Training spend one year in training at a university regional training center. They complete a graduate-level curriculum, teach four Reading Recovery students daily, meet numerous field requirements, attend a number of professional development events, and prepare to implement the program in their home district.
3. **Trainer of Teacher Leaders Training** is a postdoctoral program provided at 5 sites across North America. The one-year residency program prepares university faculty to teach children, provide instruction to Teacher Leaders-in-training and operate a regional training center.

We read all the time together. If she needs help on a word she asks me. But most of the time she says, "Don't help me mom. I can get it.

Parent
Fox Chapel School District

Shippensburg University Training Site

Historical Overview of the Establishment of the Shippensburg University Training Site

Three years of intensive planning and research by Shippensburg University administration and local district personnel lead to the implementation of a Reading Recovery University training site.

During the 1991-92 academic year, the Department of Teacher Education sent two professors, Drs. John Martin and Mary Jane Urbanowicz, to The Ohio State University to investigate the possibility of becoming a teacher leader training site. Dr. Lance Landauer, Superintendent of Conewago Valley School District, contacted Drs. Robert Bartos and Peggy Hockersmith to express his support for Shippensburg University as a state training site. Many planning meetings occurred during this year with Shippensburg School District through Ms. B. J. Irvin and Ms. Grace Miller who assisted in exploring possibilities for a training site.

The following academic year (1992-93), Drs. Robert Bartos, Peggy Hockersmith, Lance Landauer, and Ms. Virginia Hillyard, teacher leader for the Conewago Site, met with Pennsylvania State Department officials in Harrisburg in an attempt to gain support for the university effort. Also at this meeting was Mr. Richard Brickley, NDN facilitator for the state of PA, who also envisioned a training site at Shippensburg University. This meeting generated interest at the state department. The state department officials advised Shippensburg University to submit a grant proposal for PDE funds to implement a state site. Upon approval of this grant, Shippensburg University applied to The Ohio State University Reading Recovery Program for approval as a site. Approval was given contingent upon the designee for training as a Trainer of Teacher Leaders.

During the 1992 spring and fall semesters, the teacher education department was asked to determine any interest in the department for training at The Ohio State University. The result of the department's discussions was unanimous support for the program and the hiring of a faculty member for Reading Recovery . In March of 1993, Janet Bufalino was hired to pursue training at The Ohio State University. Dr. Peggy Hockersmith, Assistant Dean, was chosen to be Site Coordinator for the university training site.

During the 1993-94 academic year, Dr. Bufalino completed training at The Ohio State University. In Pennsylvania, during this same time frame, Deans Robert Bartos and Peggy Hockersmith worked to have courses approved by the Graduate Council and to establish the Shippensburg University Training site. Mr. Richard Brickley, Ms. Terri Williams, Ms. B. J. Irvin., Dr. Lance Landauer, and Deans Bartos and Hockersmith worked with the Pennsylvania Steering Committee to plan for the first year of operation for the state site.

The Pennsylvania Reading Recovery Network

Shippensburg University
Trainer of Teacher Leaders → teach children

↓ trains

↓

School District
Teacher Leaders → teach children

↓ train

↓

Schools
Teachers → teach children

A Program for School Districts

The main objective of the Shippensburg Reading Recovery training site is to train Teacher Leaders for school districts within Pennsylvania and adjoining states. During the 1994-1995 school year, nine school district personnel from Pennsylvania and Maryland were trained to become Teacher Leaders for eight (8) school district/consortium teacher training sites. Also, this class establishes three (3) new Reading Recovery Teacher Training sites in Pennsylvania and two (2) in Maryland. All Teacher Leaders-in-Training enrolled in this training class were based in their home district and serviced children from their respective school districts/sites.

During the 1995-1996 school year, seven (7) school district personnel from Pennsylvania are in training to become teacher leaders. Two (2) of the seven teacher leaders-in-training enrolled relocated to the Shippensburg area for training. The remaining five (5) class members were based in their home districts.

Teacher Leader Training at Shippensburg University

Throughout the year, Teacher Leaders-in-Training are enrolled in 18 graduate credits at SUP with three broad objectives:

1. learning to teach children,
2. learning to teach teachers,
3. learning theory relevant to Reading Recovery.

Specific responsibilities include:

1. fulfilling Reading Recovery teaching responsibilities by teaching four children in 30 minute individual sessions;
2. keeping relevant records;
3. attending and participating in clinic, theory, and seminar class sessions weekly and completing class assignments;
4. teach behind a one-way glass three times during the school year;
5. collecting test data;
6. observing and assisting teacher leaders working in the field in conducting their clinical training classes, in visiting teachers, in reviewing records and assessments, and in preparing reports;
7. successfully fulfilling oral and written presentation requirements both fall and spring semesters;
8. maintaining strong communications with the home district toward implementation planning and initiation; and
9. attending a Reading Recovery Conference and attending the Teacher Leader Institute.

For the first time I really felt empowered as I knew that I had something very effective to offer those students in my charge.

Bethlehem Area School District,
Teacher-in-Training

Overview of Reading Recovery Teachers, Students, and Sites 1994-1995

During the 1994-1995 school year, six Pennsylvania and two Maryland school districts sent nine teachers to Shippensburg University for teacher-leader training. This increased the training sites in Pennsylvania to twelve and two new sites in Maryland. (Maryland statistics will not be included in this report.)

Table 1

Summary of TL and Teacher Implementation in Pennsylvania

1990-1995

School Year	TL-in Training	PA Sites in Operation	Teachers Trained
90-91	4		
91-92	1	4 * & **	51 (all new)
92-93	2	6 ** & ***	127 (76 new)
93-94		7	209 (133 new)
94-95	9 (2 MD sites)****	8	295 (88 new)

* *Although four PA teachers were trained as Teacher Leaders, upon returning to PA, only three training sites were established during the 1991-1992 school year. One training site did not establish a site, therefore, the Teacher Leader from that site combined with another Teacher Leader to train a teacher class.*

** *A trained Teacher Leader from Ohio was employed on a temporary basis to teach a class while the district/site employee was in training at The Ohio State University for Teacher Leader training.*

*** *A Teacher Leader who was trained during the 1990-91 school year and did not have her own site was employed by a PA school district where a new site was established during the 1992-93 school year.*

**** *Three Teacher Leaders who completed training during the 1994-1995 academic year* ***were not an active*** *Reading Recovery Teacher Training Site during the 1995-96 academic year.*

Conestoga Valley School District students, Travis and Trevor Griffith.

Table 2

Summary of Districts Implementation and Children Serviced in Pennsylvania

1990-1995

Year	Districts	Program	Discontinued	% Discontinued
1991-92	26	272	230	85%
1992-93	58	665	595	89%
1993-94	72	1184	1057	89%
1994-95	78	1585	1361	86%

Program Implementation

A realistic plan for development of a Reading Recovery teacher training site is two years: one year to have a member of the staff trained as a teacher leader at Shippensburg University and a second year to establish the training site, which involves beginning to train teachers, and begin to service children.

The Application Process

To become an approved teacher training site, a school district (or consortium of districts) begins by applying to the Shippensburg University Regional Training Center to have a qualified member of its teaching staff trained as a teacher leader. As part of the application process, prospective sites must secure financial support within the district and obtain the approval of the district superintendent.

The applying district or consortium also selects an administrator to assume administrative responsibilities for Reading Recovery. This "site coordinator" oversees the preparation of the facility, manages the budget, negotiates contracts, and acts as an administrative liaison with the Reading Recovery network.

The Training Year

Applicants are selected for the program in the spring, and the year-long program begins the following autumn. If the applicant lives two hours or more from the regional training center, residency is required. The program for teacher leaders includes the following five components:

1. A graduate-level curriculum consisting of a clinical practicum, a seminar in theory and current research, and supervised fieldwork,
2. The daily teaching of four Reading Recovery students,
3. Field requirements, including assisting with the training of Reading Recovery teachers, conducting colleague visits to observe other class members teaching Reading Recovery lessons, and visiting other Reading Recovery sites,
4. Preparation for implementing Reading Recovery in their district,
5. Attendance at a number of professional development conferences, institutes, and meetings.

Initially when I found out that my daughter was in the Reading Recovery program, I thought that she must be having problems and didn't know what to expect. I even felt sorry for her. But after she began the program and I started seeing the results, I thought she was actually the lucky one. The difference in her reading level from the beginning of the school year to now is quite amazing. Thank you for everything.

Parent
Shippensburg Area School District

The Implementation Year

Following the training year, teacher leaders and site coordinators work together to maintain the site. Teacher Leaders train new teachers, collect data on children served, receive site visits, and prepare an annual site report. They also participate in a variety of continuing contact events and activities, including national conferences and training seminars in order to further their own professional development.

Teacher Training at Reading Recovery Sites

To implement Reading Recovery at the classroom level in districts where the program has been adopted, qualified teachers enroll in a year-long academic course of study taught by a certified teacher leader. This course of study is offered for graduate credit through affiliation with Shippensburg University. Through interactive clinical experiences and theoretical study guided by a teacher leader, teachers learn how to implement all components of a Reading Recovery lesson and to select teaching procedures appropriate for individual students.

Teachers in training continue to work full-time in their school districts as they receive instruction in Reading Recovery procedures. The most common arrangement during the training year and subsequent years is for the teacher to spend half a day teaching Reading Recovery students and the second half in other teaching duties.

Implementation Models

Reading Recovery has been implemented using a wide variety of models. Reading Recovery teachers are required to spend half of the instruction day (two and one-half hours minimum) working one-on-one with children (at least four). The remainder of the day is assigned to various functions, as indicated by the following examples of teaching assignment configurations:

- Title 1 remedial reading or special education teachers spend half their day in Reading Recovery and the other half working with individuals or small groups using other instructional strategies.
- Kindergarten teachers spend half their day in Reading Recovery and the other half teaching a kindergarten class.
- Two teachers share a first grade classroom where one teaches the class while the other teacher implements Reading Recovery with individual children. Roles are switched for the second half of the day.
- IST teachers spend half their day in Reading Recovery and the other half implementing IST responsibilities.

The Cost of Implementation

The costs of adopting Reading Recovery include those associated with the establishment of a site, as well as ongoing site maintenance. Start-up expenses include training fees, materials, and expenses for the in-training teacher leader; the installation of a one-way glass at the new site for teacher training; and a portion of the site coordinator's salary during the training year. Following the training year, sites provide funding for teacher leader salaries, continuing contact for teacher leaders, site staff support, and training materials. For specific information regarding costs, please contact the Shippensburg University Regional Training Center.

Discussion of Research Results

The objectives of the research plan were to gather and combine data from established Reading Recovery Teacher Training Sites from the 1994-1995 school year.

Definition of terms:

The following definitions are used in this report:

Reading Recovery Program Children. Children who receive 60 or more lessons in Reading Recovery or who received less than 60 lessons and were successfully discontinued from the program.

Discontinued Reading Recovery Children. Children who successfully completed the program and who were officially released during the year or children who met the criteria to be released at the final testing in May.

Not Discontinued Reading Recovery Children. Those children who had 60 or more lessons but were not officially discontinued (released) from the program for various reasons, including moving from the school, not having time to complete a program before the end of school, being placed in another program such as special education, or not responding adequately to the program after twenty weeks of instruction.

Random Sample. Children from the Pennsylvania sites who were randomly selected from the total population of first grade children. This sample represents a rigorous standard for comparison because it excludes children who received any Reading Recovery lessons and is, therefore, drawn from middle- and upper-achievement level children. This total group provides a basis for determining an average range for comparison as a State Average Band.

Average Band. The range of scores extending .5 standard deviations below and .5 standard deviations above the mean, computed on data from the Random Sample.

> ***My child approaches homework, since Reading Recovery, with a positive - = not negative attitude. He attempts more things that previously appeared difficult to him. He takes more risks to read print in his environment.***
>
> **Parent**
> ***Penn Manor School District***

Dependent Measures:

The three dependent measures used for the study are from the *Observation Survey* (Clay, 1993) and are described below.

Writing Vocabulary: Children are asked to write down all the words they knew how to write in 10 minutes. This measure has no ceiling, however, the time limit constrains the upper level of scores.

Dictation: Children read a sentence and are asked to write the words. In scoring, children are given credit for every sound represented correctly, thus indicating the child's ability to analyze words for sounds and represent them with letters. The ceiling score for each form of this measure is 37 sounds.

Text Reading: Children are told the title of a selection, given a brief, standard introduction and asked to read text materials in graded levels of difficulty. The child's text reading level indicates the highest level of text that he/she read at 90% accuracy or better. Text materials in graded levels of difficulty are constructed for testing purposes.

These texts are used for testing and research purposes only. They are not the same as materials used in Reading Recovery instruction and they are not used as instructional materials in any first grade classrooms.

Question 1:

What proportion of Reading Recovery Program Children were discontinued in the state of Pennsylvania during the 1994-1995 school year?

Discontinuation testing is completed by an independent tester and the decision to discontinue is carefully made in conjunction with the teacher leader and in consultation with the classroom teacher. The following areas are used for consideration when attempting to make a decision concerning the discontinuation of a student:

- The highest level of Text Reading at 90% accuracy or better,
- scores and patterns of performance on two measures: Writing Vocabulary and Dictation,
- reading behavior as shown in recent running records and the Text Reading tests,
- achievement in the classroom instructional program.

Discussion of Results: Table 1 (p. 5) illustrates a summary of the progress made by program and discontinued Reading Recovery children in Pennsylvania. Throughout the three school years illustrated, the number of children served increased approximately 40% illustrating the growth of the program in the state of Pennsylvania.

Also, the percentages reached in the state of Pennsylvania during all three school years meet and/or surpass the national average rate of 85%.

Table 3

Summary Table of the Status of Pennsylvania Reading Recovery Children 1991-92, 1992-93, 1993-94, 1994-95

	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95
Children Served	372	934	1565	2095
Program Children	272	665	1184	1585
Discontinued	230	595	1057	1361
% of Discontinued	85	89	89	86

Question 2

What was the progress of Discontinued and Program Reading Recovery Children in the State of Pennsylvania during the 1994-1995 school year?

Comparisons of September and May scores were made on the three measures of the Observation Survey: 1. Writing Vocabulary, 2. Dictation, and 3. Text Reading, for both Discontinued and Program Reading Recovery Children.

Table 4

Summary of Observation Survey Scores for Discontinued and Program Reading Recovery Children, 1994-1995

Measure	Month of testing	Discontinued RR children (mean)	Program RR children (mean)
Writing Vocabulary	Fall	4.73 *	4.53 ***
	Spring	51.26 **	49.63****
Dictation	Fall	6.62 *	6.20***
	Spring	35.23**	34.76****
Text Rdg. Levels	Fall	0.69*	0.67***
	Spring	17.74**	16.64****

* *1096 children in sample*
** *1347 children in sample*
*** *1312 children in sample*
**** *1556 children in sample*

Question 3

What proportion of Pennsylvania Discontinued children achieved end-of-year scores equal to or exceeding the State Average Band during the 1994-1995 school year?

End-of-year scores on three measures of the Observation Survey, 1. Writing Vocabulary, 2. Dictation, and 3. Text Reading for discontinued and Program children were compared to a State Average Band. The average band was determined by calculating the mean for each of these three measures for a group of randomly selected first grade students at schools in Reading Recovery sites across Pennsylvania. The average band was considered to be .5 standard deviations above and below the mean. In computing the average band, children who had received any Reading Recovery lessons were deleted from the sample.

Table 5

1994-1995 Discontinued Reading Recovery Children Reaching the Average Band in May

(Number of discontinued children tested 1347)

Measure	Average Band	# of Discontinued RR children equal to avg. band	Percentage
Writing Vocab.	41.6 - 58.29	1082	80%
Dictation	31.16 - 36.53	1295	96%
Text Reading Level	14.28 - 22.52	1071	80%

Question 4

What proportion of Pennsylvania Program children achieved end-of-year scores equal or exceeding the State Average Band?

End-of-year scores on three measures of the Observation Survey: 1. Writing Vocabulary, 2. Dictation, and 3. Text Reading for discontinued and Program children were compared to a State Average Band. The average band was determined by calculating the mean for each of these three measures for a group of randomly selected first grade students at schools in Reading Recovery sites across Pennsylvania. The average band was considered to be .5 standard deviations above and below the mean. In computing the average band, children who had received any Reading Recovery lessons were deleted from the sample.

Table 6

1994-1995 Program Reading Recovery Children Reaching the Average Band

(Number of program children tested - 1556)

Measure	Average Band	# of Discontinued RR children equal to avg. band	Percentage
Writing Vocab.	41.06 - 58.29	1168	75%
Dictation	31.06 - 36.53	1439	92%
Text Reading Level	14.28 - 22.52	1075	69%

Question 5

What proportion of serviced Reading Recovery children were discontinued during the following school years: 1991-1992, 1992-1993, 1993-1994, and 1994-1995?

Table 7

Summary Table of Pennsylvania Children Serviced in Reading Recovery

1991-92, 1992-93, 1993-94, 1994-95

	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95
Children Served	372	934	1565	2095
Discontinued	230	595	1057	1361
% of Discontinued	62	64	67.5	65

Reading Recovery Training Sites

Pennsylvania

Appalachia IU #8

Mr. David Kline, Site Coordinator (814-472-7680)
Ms. Joan Korch, Teacher Leader (814-267-4649)

Bethlehem

Ms. Ann Goldberg, Site Coordinator (610-865-7880)
Ms. Maria Fernandes, Teacher Leader (610-868-6071)

Central Columbia School District

Ms. Betty Meckley, Site Coordinator and Teacher Leader (717-784-6120)

Conewago Valley School District

Dr. Lance Landauer, Site Coordinator (717-624-2157)
Ms. Virginia Hillyard, Teacher Leader (717-624-2157)
Ms. Sue Bevenour, Teacher Leader (717-632-2036)

Cumberland Valley School District

Ms. Mary Lee Carrolus, Site Coordinator (717-258-6208)
Ms. Kathy Luft, Site Coordinator (717-258-6208)
Mr. Todd Brown, Teacher Leader (717-766-4911)

Derry Area School District

Ms. Cindy Patton, Site Coordinator (412-532-1109)
Ms. Nadine Woods, Teacher Leader (412-532-1109)

East Pennsboro Area School District

Ms. Kim Bright, Site Coordinator (717-732-3610)
Ms. Christine Frencheck, Teacher Leader (717-732-0441)

Fox Chapel School District

Dr. Carol Miller, Site Coordinator (412-963-9600)
Ms. Patsy Rucker, Teacher Leader (412-967-2509)

Lancaster Lebanon IU#13

Ms. Gretchen McFarland, Site Coordinator (717-560-4614)
Ms. Barbara Maestle, Teacher Leader (717-445-8620)
Mr. Craig Ausel, Teacher Leader (717-394-0555)

Mifflin County School District

Mr. James Schnell, Site Coordinator (717-248-6771)
Ms. Carole Auker, Teacher Leader (717-436-6777)

North Penn School District

Dr. Carol Turoczi, Site Coordinator (215-368-0400)
Ms. Terri Williams, Site Coordinator (610-630-7905)
Ms. Susan Derstine, Teacher Leader (215-362-2200)

Northwest Tri-County IU #5

Mr. Greg Martin, Site Coordinator (814-734-5610, ext. 205)
Ms. Debbie Sturn, Site Coordinator (814-734-5610)
Ms. Pam Vergona, Teacher Leader (814-654-7812)

Penn Manor School District

Dr. Gary Campbell, Site Coordinator (717-872-9500, ext. 222)
Ms. Barbara Shelley, Teacher Leader (717-399-1582)

Grade two teachers talk positively about the impact of Reading Recovery® on children who have participated. Slowly, it is gaining the respect it deserves.

Administrator, Northwest Tri-County Intermediate Unit

Shippensburg Area School District

Ms. B. J. Irvin, Site Coordinator (717-530-2719)
Ms. Grace Miller, Teacher Leader (717-530-2790)
Ms. Marion Diehl, Teacher Leader (717-530-2790)

Shippensburg University Teacher Leader Training Site

Dr. Peggy Hockersmith, Site Coordinator (717-532-1487)
Dr. Janet Bufalino, Trainer of Teacher Leaders (717-532-1166)

Stroudsburg Area School District

Mr. Stephen Brodmerkel, Site Coordinator (717-421-6371)
Ms. Jennie Manley, Teacher Leader (717-421-6371)

Williamsport Area School District

Dr. Debbie Grove, Site Coordinator (717-327-5500, Ext. 3531)
Ms. Charlotte Allgeier, Teacher Leader (717-332-7853)

The School District of the City of York

Ms. Joann Boston, Site Coordinator (717-845-3571)
Ms. Sallie Bulk, Teacher Leader (717-849-1223)
Ms. Amy Cuba, Teacher Leader (717-845-3571)

Maryland Training Sites

Anne Arundel County School System

Ms. Starr W' iten, Site Coordinator (410-222-5444)
Ms. Donna Spencer, Teacher Leader (410-222-1626)

Frederick County School System

Dr. Martha Bauer, Site Coordinator (301-694-1623)
Ms. Jan Cline, Teacher Leader (301-694-4627)

For more information contact:

Dr. Janet Bufalino
Trainer of Teacher Leaders
Shippensburg University
717-532-1166

or

Dr. Peggy Hockersmith
Site Coordinator
Shippensburg University
717-532-1487

Facsimile 717-530-4012

Shippensburg University

A member of Pennsylvania's State System of Higher Education

Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania, in compliance with federal and state laws and university policy, provides equal educational, employment, and economic opportunities for all persons without regard to race, gender, age, ethnicity, national origin, religion, sexual orientation, or marital, veteran, or disability status. Direct requests for disability accommodations and other inquiries to the Office of Social Equity, Old Main 109, Shippensburg University, 1871 Old Main Drive, Shippensburg, PA 17257-2299, (717) 532-1161.

11/96-500